

***Remarks***

This Amendment responds to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2005. Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are pending. The indication of allowability of claims 6-9 is noted with appreciation. In this Amendment, claim 6 is cancelled and claim 1 is amended to incorporate the feature recited in claim 6. Thus, claims 1-5 and 7-9 should now be in condition for allowance. Claim 5 is amended to increase its scope, and not to overcome a prior art rejection. Claim 7 is amended to make it dependent on claim 1 instead of cancelled claim 6.

**Response to Prior Art Rejections**

The pending rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested based on the remarks and amendments herein. In view of the indication of allowability of claim 6, and the amendment to claim 1 to add the feature of claim 6, the pending rejections have been overcome. Therefore, applicant will not address the pending rejections and assertions in detail. Applicants respectfully disagree with assertions in the Office Action regarding the cited references, particularly (without limitation) those relating to the cited Fumagalli and Conrad et al. patents, but as those rejections are now moot, applicant will not discuss herein specific points of disagreement with the comments in the Office Action.

**Response to Drawing Objections**

The objection to the drawings appears to be based on an interpretation of claim 5 in which two separately detachable dust collecting containers are required. Embodiments with two separate containers are described in the specification, but as correctly noted by the Examiner, not separately illustrated in the drawings. Claim 5 has therefore been amended to increase its scope and to make it more general with regard to the nature of the dust collecting

structure. In particular, amended claim 5 uses broad language that does not specifically recite two independent container structures, but broadly recites “containers” that may be either combined or separate. The drawing figures in the present application support the language of amended claim 5.

#### IDS Submissions

Applicant notes that two additional IDS filings by applicants, dated March 31, 2005 and April 26, 2005, crossed in the mail with the Office Action and have not yet been considered. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider those IDS filings in due course.


#### Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending rejections are overcome by the amendments and remarks herein. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested on that basis, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. If a telephone or personal conference would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, who will cooperate appropriately to advance the case.

Please charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment thereof, to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (116511-00117). In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to render this submission timely, Applicant hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for such an extension for as many months as are required to

render this submission timely, and request that the PTO charge the extension fee to the deposit account as authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael C. Greenbaum  
Reg. No. 28,419

BLANK ROME LLP  
600 New Hampshire Ave, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037  
Telephone: (202) 772-5800  
Facsimile: (202) 772-5858